



## **Beyond the "Holy See": Parody and Narrative Assemblage in "Cyclops"**

**By: Mark Nunes**

**No Abstract**

## Beyond the “Holy See”: Parody and Narrative Assemblage in “Cyclops”

MARK NUNES

The “Cyclops” chapter of *Ulysses*, with its first-person narrator, its multiple parodic forms, and its shifting points of reference, presents a narrative puzzle in which narrative form itself plays a crucial role in the tangle. Although the chapter opens with an apparently well-defined narrative point of view—a talented, if overly opinionated, barroom raconteur—the reader soon finds that this singular “I” at the center of the chapter is hardly a unique, or for that matter central, authorial eye. On 33 occasions, parodic “intrusions” cause the narrative to shift points of view.<sup>1</sup> These shifts set up a paradoxical move that grants narrative centrality to a given form, while at the same time revealing the limitations of that positioning. The result is a chapter that transforms multiple failed attempts at direct narration into a productive narrative model, defined by the interaction of a multiplicity. Each shift results in a proliferation of narration through these multiplying “reports of eyewitnesses” (*U* 12.1869–81). As eyewitnesses proliferate—interrupting, canceling, and contradicting each other—narratives begin to serve as supplements to one another. While this proliferation undermines the authority of any single, direct narration, the interaction of these multiple forms affords Joyce the possibility of creating a multilinear narrative assemblage in the place of authorial, authoritative narration.

Narrative delineation in “Cyclops” serves to mark the limitations of any given narrative framework. The “central” I-narrator brings this feature of the chapter into high relief by his prominent delineation as a character. That which defines him as narrator also serves as his narrative limit. He is in effect a parody of narrative authority, neither all-seeing nor all-knowing. His opinions shape the facts of the story and, like the names of characters he occasionally forgets, whatever does not fall under the eye of the narrator

does not become a part of his narrative. In addition to marking this lack of impartial omniscience, Joyce also calls attention to the limitations of the narrative scope by emphasizing the I-narrator's bodily presence, a fact most notable when the I-narrator exits the bar to relieve himself, taking the narration with him (*U* 12.1561–72). Likewise, the chapter reads more as a *retelling* rather than a running commentary, with Joyce emphasizing the act of storytelling by writing out the *so's* and *anyhow's*.<sup>2</sup> These features of the chapter delineate the narrator's character and, in doing so, emphasize the limitations of this perspective: that we are hearing a version of the events in Barney Kiernan's pub.

In a similar fashion, the delineation of various genres by way of parody forces the reader's attention on the means by which "narrative frame" serves as both limit and condition of possibility for narration. As Michael Groden notes, the parodies in "Cyclops" and other "middle stage" chapters allowed Joyce to introduce "a relativity in the point of view that is much stronger than the variations among the initial-style episodes" (155). Each narrative "interruption" radically alters the account of events in the section, calling attention to the way in which telling shapes the tale. Like "Circe," "Cyclops" is a chapter of metamorphoses; but in this section of the novel, character transformations occur as a direct result of changes in narrative frame. As early as the first page of the chapter, the I-narrator demonstrates the means by which narrative form determines narrative content. In order to voice his perspective on Herzog the merchant, he literally gives voice to Herzog by impersonating him: "*He drink me my teas. He eat me my sugars. Because he no pay me my moneys?*" (*U* 12.31–32). But the narrative is equally involved in a less-obvious process of (im)personation when creating Geraghty in the character of "the most notorious bloody robber" (*U* 12.25). Narration in this chapter is always a form of impersonation; representation *in propria persona* is not possible.<sup>3</sup> Herzog and Geraghty firmly remain in these "personations" for as long as they remain within the I-narrator's narrative frame. The first parodic "intrusion" results in a break from that frame, but also in a transformation of Herzog into "Moses Herzog . . . merchant, hereinafter called the vendor" and Geraghty into "Michael E. Geraghty . . . gentleman, hereinafter called the purchaser": descriptions appropriate to the legal narrative in which the reader now finds them (*U* 12.33–51). Bloom in particular undergoes numerous metamorphoses—parodic transmigrations of the soul, so to speak. Each shift in narration provides a new perspective with its own terms, characterizations, and interests, as well as its own narrative limits. The medical journal parody, for example, transforms Bloom's muddled scientific knowledge into a precise explication of physiology, as he himself becomes Herr Professor Luitpold Blumenduft (*U* 12.468–78). Although the

reader feels compelled to discredit these parodic narratives because of their "inaccuracy," Joyce makes it clear throughout the chapter that the I-narrator, with his open biases, prejudices, and opinions, is equally limited. In both instances, conspicuous and questionable authorities lead the reader to suspect the accuracy and reliability of narration. In place of any clear opposition between "straight" first-person narrative and "distorted" parody, "Cyclops" offers up an assortment of inaccurate narratives, leaving the reader to conclude that the chapter contains no reliable eyewitness to the events in Barney Kiernan's.

Throughout the chapter, the narrative frame forms and transforms character; separate narrative perspectives "see" these characters differently and present them in a form appropriate to their narrative context. In this regard, Polyphemus makes a *formal* appearance in this chapter; each narrative frame, like separate narrative one-eyed witnesses, is singular and limited. Perhaps most pressing of the monocular monster's limitations is his inability to produce a parallax—that slight shift in perspective between two eyes that produces depth vision. A cyclops literally lacks depth perception; in "Cyclops," each narrative eyewitness likewise lacks depth. The I-narrator gives the reader a "lardfaced," money-tight, Freemason Leopold Bloom, fond of "jawbreakers" and an occasional seat on "his high horse about the jews" (*U* 12.1798). But through the parodies, the reader also gets a vision of Bloom as the hero and patriot "O'Bloom, the son of Rory" (*U* 12.215–17), the scientist and Herr Professor (*U* 12.468–78), the skillful orator of the controversial (*U* 12.912–913), "the distinguished phenomenologist" "Nagyasagos uram Lipoti Virag" (*U* 12.1819–28), and ultimately ben Bloom Elijah (*U* 12.1910–18). These parodic passages are no more accurate than the I-narrator's monocular view of Bloom, but they do give other glimpses of Bloom's character that fall well outside the I-narrator's purview. This play between what a parody presents and what it mocks calls attention to the features that define it as a distinct narrative form, in the same way the ever-present "I" calls attention to himself and his limitations throughout his narration. In both instances, Joyce foregrounds those facets in any narration that both define and limit it as a narrative structure.

Claims of narrative authority, centrality, or totality, like a singular eye, ultimately become a sign of narrative limitation. The I-narrator's claim to authorial centrality in the context of these competing parodic narratives calls attention to the limits of his view, that which his apparently complete and total narrative cannot contain. But these parodic intrusions are equally guilty of trying to assume the position of "the spiritual authority of the Holy See," a position that no narrative frame can claim in this chapter (*U* 12.1886). All narratives create their own monstrosities in their attempt to

achieve this role of the central "I." At the same time, each narrative frame creates a context that calls forth competing perspectives that "overflow" its limits, or that go beyond the margins of its authority. In this regard, "Cyclops"'s multiple, limited perspectives emphasize both the constructive and restrictive qualities of narrative; each monocular perspective can only succeed within its own limitations, and these same limitations implicate any number of excluded perspectives.

The relation between these narrative perspectives parallels what Fredric Jameson describes as a postmodern intertextuality (exemplified by "total flow" video montage): "the rewriting of one form of narrativization in terms of a different, momentarily more powerful one, the ceaseless renarrativization of already existent narrative elements by each other" (88). Joyce's own expression "alternating asymmetry" (Herring 123) hints at a similar intertextual relation between separate narrative frames. While Gilbert uses the technic "gigantism" to emphasize "inflation" and rupture in the chapter, Joyce's earlier term places even greater emphasis on the formal challenges of the chapter and, in particular, on the role of narrative interaction (274). Parody, this term suggests, creates a parallax: shifting monocular narratives that present alternate and asymmetrical perspectives, simultaneously revealing the capabilities and the limitations of any single narrative framework. But this term also allows for some rather restrictive interpretations of how these narratives interact. One well-established approach to this term, and hence to the chapter, has been to assume that the I-narrator and the parodic narratives stand in a bimodal relation or, as gigantism suggests, that the first-person narration stands primary to the secondary parodic narratives.<sup>4</sup> This approach constructs a binary model of first-person narration and parodic intrusion, what Dermot Kelly calls a "two-tiered" or "double-barreled narrative," which either explicitly or implicitly places the parody in the position of comment on the more central first-person narration (28). All of these approaches align with Kenner's description of parody as a "double writing," which "rests on double vision: a vision of duality" (*Dublin's* 177). But as Kenner elsewhere notes, "*At the very least*, on the model of two-eyed men, reality exacted a doubling" for Joyce (*Joyce's* 83; italics mine). Although a dual-perspective model is simplest when a narrative asymmetry is discussed, it may oversimplify Joyce's strategy by failing to acknowledge that each mode of parody in this section, *at the very least* 15 separate narrative forms, speaks in its own voice and provides for a complex set of interactions.

The section offers up many moments that work against a binary model, encouraging the reader to view the chapter as a battle for narrative control between autonomous narrative frames rather than as a simple two-point al-

ternation. Parodies, after all, comment as often on one another as on the I-narrator. At times, parodies even disrupt one another: Paddy Dignam's sentence, for example, breaks off not with a return to first-person narration but with a short passage mourning the loss of "O'Dignam, sun of our morning" (U12.374–76). At times too, it is the I-narrator who functions as the disruption, interjecting "*I dare him, says he, and I doubledare him*" in the midst of an epic parody (U12.100). Elsewhere, he provides the comic disruption that breaks off longer parodies and returns us to the pub. The execution-cum-marriage, for example, breaks with what we must assume is yet another narrative "impersonation": "God blimey if she ain't a clinker, that there bleeding tart" (U12.676). These moments make it clear that "center" and "intrusion" are far from stable identities in this chapter.

The complex interaction of narrative forms in the final sentence of the chapter provides perhaps the final blow to this binary model, offering an instance of narrative tangling within a single sentence:

And they beheld Him even Him, ben Bloom Elijah, amid clouds of angels ascend to the glory of the brightness

at an angle of fortyfive degrees over Donohoe's in Little Green street

like a shot off a shovel. (U12.1915–18)

The sentence begins as a biblical epic, telling of the apotheosis of Bloom. The narrative shifts to a report on the trajectory of projectile Bloom, more fitting a scientific journal than the Bible. A final break occurs with the introduction of "Dub" colloquial, an expression that could come from no other mouth than that of the I-narrator. In this one sentence, each of the chapter's three major narrative forms makes an appearance—the epic, the journalistic, and the first person—but they stand in a complex relationship. No narrative achieves centrality. Each narrative works off the others, defining itself at the expense of others, yet at the same time exposing its own limitations. This final sentence presents in miniature the overall narrative strategy of the chapter: a stand-up routine in which multiple impersonators wrestle for center stage, each constantly losing grip of the one microphone in midsentence or midthought, or surrendering it only at the most inopportune moments.

If the narration here is "double," then it is a Derridean double of dissemination and indeterminacy. The parodies of this section interact without regard to issues of proximity or sequence, creating a complex multilinear narrative system. The parallax occurs not between two points—the central and the disruptive—but between many constantly shifting nar-

rative perspectives. I have already suggested that this shifting parallax draws close to Jameson's definition of postmodern intertextuality. One might even go so far as to describe Joyce's narrative strategy as "hypertextual," in that narrative functions as a network of discrete, interactive "lexia" in which "centrality . . . exists only as a matter of evanescence" (Lindow 70).<sup>5</sup> These and similar models of narrative as a multivocal network provide a more accurate account not only of the disruptive function of these narrative "intrusions" but also of the productive nature of their interactions. As David Kiremidjian notes, Joyce "employ[s] parodistic techniques not only to expand the scope, alter the angle of perspective or fulfill the almost endless search for variations upon a theme, but also to create the expressive medium itself" (11). In other words, rather than using parody only to undermine the limitations of direct narration, Joyce uses the interaction of multiple, failed narratives to explore narrative possibility.<sup>6</sup>

The nature of these interactions further demonstrates that something more complex is at work in this chapter than a simple binary alteration between central and disruptive narrative forms. Narrative interactions often perform either an interpretive or a creative function in "Cyclops." Interpretive narratives serve as filters that "revision" another narrative (Jameson's "renarrativization"). As Karen Lawrence and others have noted, several of these interpretive parodies fit Gilbert's description of gigantism, in which "ballooning" parodies retell the I-narrator's story in an expanded, encyclopedic form (Lawrence 101–02). In other instances, however, the parodies present a clear shift in narrative frame and not an inflation per se of the first-person narration. The I-narrator, for example, begins his narrative with a conventional opening: "I was just passing the time of day with old Troy of the DMP at the corner of Arbour hill . . . when who should I see dodging along Stony Batter only Joe Hynes" (*U* 12.1–5). The first epic parody likewise uses an opening convention, yet it casts the narrative in its own language and idiom, moving the story from Arbor hill and Stony Batter to "Inisfail the fair" (*U* 12.68–99). These shifts do not, however, establish one narrative type as primary or central; instead, each narrative makes its own attempt at authorial centrality. As a result, the chapter presents multiple lines of narration rather than a single, disjointed narrative thread. In another instance, Alf calls for a beer, the I-narrator tells us, and he receives by way of an epic interpretive filter "a crystal cup full of the foamy ebon ale which the noble twin brothers Bungiveagh and Bungardilaun brew ever in their divine alevats" (*U* 12.280–82). As with the chapter's opening, Alf Bergan's entrance into the pub occurs twice, but on this occasion it is the I-narrator who is placed in the reiterative role:

And lo, as they quaffed their cup of joy, a godlike messenger came swiftly in, radiant as the eye of heaven, a comely youth and behind him there passed an elder of noble gait and countenance, bearing the sacred scrolls of law and with him his lady wife a dame of peerless lineage, fairest of her race.

Little Alf Bergan popped in round the door and hid behind Barney's snug, squeezed up with the laughing. . . . And begob what was it only that bloody old pantaloons Denis Breen in his bathslippers with two bloody big books tucked under his oxters and the wife hotfoot after him, unfortunate wretched woman, trotting like a poodle. (U12.244–55)

Clearly these narratives are functioning "autonomously" in their attempt at narrative authority; at the same time they clearly exist in relation to one another.

Interpretive narrative frames such as these always leave the reader within the fictive confines of Barney Kiernan's, providing alternate views of the scene in the pub. Creative narrative frames, however, use parody to flee Barney Kiernan's and establish their own fictive space. For example, a conversation between Alf Bergan and Joe Hynes over Paddy Dignam's death—and Alf's assertion that he saw Dignam on the street minutes earlier—gives rise to a seance that takes place well beyond the walls of the pub (U12.338–73). It is these creative narrative frames that most clearly complicate binary approaches to narrative in the chapter, while at the same time suggesting how narrative interaction establishes an indirect narrative form for Joyce. These narrative excursions occur several times, the longest being the execution/marriage (U12.525–75) and the procession of Saint Malaysia, Saint Patrick, and Father O'Flynn (U12.1676–1750). Although these passages do expand from a point within the I-narrator's tale, the moments of "gigantism" are rather aleatory, hardly worth the length and duration if they were merely secondary to the I-narrator. The parodies that emerge take control of the narrative frame to have their say, regardless of whether the plot advances, retreats, or veers drastically aside.

Perhaps the most telling feature of these narratives is their tendency to lose their parodic tone. The epic-religious-journalistic parody that erupts from Martin Cunningham's barroom blessing starts as an endless parade of saints performing miracles and bearing palms, inkhorns, and babes in bathtubs, but collapses finally into a blessing that, translated, shows no real parodic elements:

O God, by whose word all things are made holy, pour down your blessing on these which you created. Grant that whoever, giving thanks to you, uses them in accordance with your law and your will,



may by calling on your holy name receive through your aid health  
of body and protection of soul, through Christ our Lord.<sup>7</sup>

(U12.1746–50)

Compared with Mulligan's blasphemous inversions in "Circe" and Stephen's ironic Latin fragments in "Telemachus," Father O'Flynn's words, though occurring within a "parodic intrusion," sound neither distorted nor parodic. The dissonant context that deflates this blessing occurs outside this narrative's delimiting frame when the I-narrator once again gains control, functioning here as the voice of disruption: "And so say all of us, says Jack" (U12.1751).<sup>8</sup> Narrative centrality is at best a tentative position in this chapter, marking each competing narrative as a relative intrusion. Furthermore, the relation between limited, competing narrative frames makes it clear that beyond this relative binary play of center and disruptive margin, "Cyclops" develops a far more complex interplay of multiple frames across multiple narratives.

As these interactions develop, the distinction between parody and "straight" narrative continues to blur. The alternating asymmetry of "Cyclops" refuses to reduce to a binary opposition of naturalized and parodic narratives, suggesting in its place a complexity of resonant, yet autonomous, narratives that cancel, contradict, interpret, and misinterpret one another. A creed parody, for example, that has occurred earlier in the chapter, "whence he shall come to drudge for a living and be paid" (U12.1354–59), still resonates when the Citizen starts to speak in hackneyed phrases of the potato famine and the Irish exodus to America: "And they will come again with a vengeance, no cravens, the sons of Granuaile, the champions of Kathleen ni Houlihan" (U12.1373–75). The force of the preceding frame creates, in effect, a context that bends the Citizen's "straight" (albeit clichéd) speech into the orbit of parody. Likewise, the Citizen's concern over Ireland's exfoliation becomes the grounds for the conifer wedding parody, but by this point in the chapter, his epic tone has already been undermined by similar parodic praise for the "firstclass foliage . . . and other ornaments of the arboreal world with which that region is thoroughly well supplied" (U12.76–78). This blurring of boundaries occurs between parodies as well, further multiplying the "alternating asymmetries" with each encounter between narrative contexts. As several critics have noted, a majority of the 33 parodies fall within two categories: the journalistic and the epic.<sup>9</sup> Yet far from creating a dialectic between the diurnal and the eternal, the network of contexts that develops between these two forms creates a mutual pollution of both attempts at authoritative narration. The journalism passages, like the "historic and hefty battle" of Myler and Percy's boxing match, start

to sound like epic parodies (*U* 12.960–87). Likewise, in the account of the conifer wedding it becomes difficult to distinguish a social page parody from a romance parody. The journalistic parodies the epic, but the epic reflexively parodies the journalistic. What develops, then, is an elaboration of narrative through a proliferation of narrative form. Monocular, direct narrative gives way to an indirect, comic narrative of many voices and visions in which multiple interactions replace singular, failed authoritative narration.

As Karen Lawrence notes, “‘Cyclops’ illustrates that there is no ‘privileged’ style. In it, no language is allowed to stand unparodied” (114). But the combined failures of individual narrative forms seem to point, at least indirectly, to narrative possibility through a larger, interactive system. Each narrative in the section—most apparently that of the I-narrator—makes an attempt at monoglossia, that central position of the “Holy See”; in failing, each becomes a part of an interactive system of what Bahktin calls “interillumination,” in which various narrative forms expose both their limits and their possibilities (17). This Bahktinian language of polyvocality, like earlier references in this article to intertextuality or hypertextuality, provides models for describing the means by which a multitude of narrative voices can play off each other, and in doing so create a dialogue between forms.

This sort of approach to “Cyclops” avoids falling into the trap of limiting parody to disruptive or destructive narrative functions. Following Bahktin, we might argue that “[t]he liberty to crudely degrade” granted by parody also allows “an intense spirit of inquiry and a utopian fantasy” to express itself (26). The parodies in this section (and throughout the novel), in other words, do more than debase narrative and novelistic assumptions; they explore and experiment with narrative possibility.<sup>10</sup> In this context, Joyce’s 1920 schema term “egocidal terror” takes on new significance. The parodies in this section perform an egocide on the “I” of the monoglossic narrative, a blinding of the eyewitness, so to speak. But this egocide by way of interactive parodies in turn opens up the possibility for multiple narrative encounters between the reader and the text.

This method of exploration and experimentation becomes for Joyce a productive narrative strategy. It is a significant quality of Joyce’s parody that all narratives show their limitations and their strengths simultaneously. Similarly, each narrative form stands distinctly on its own as a failed attempt at direct narration, while at the same time providing a context for interactions between other narratives. This network of connections holds together not as a closed system or a “whole” but rather as a “multiplicity”—what Gilles Deleuze refers to as an assemblage: “[T]he assemblage’s only unity is that of co-functioning: it is a symbiosis, a ‘sympathy’”. It is never filiations which

are important, but alliances, alloys" (Deleuze and Parnet 69). Although in *A Thousand Plateaus* Deleuze and Guattari refer to Joyce as providing a "false open" text, the interactions of narratives in this chapter seem to indicate the sort of "rhizomatic" narrative structure that resists singular narrative and replaces it with a heterogeneous assemblage.<sup>11</sup> Rather than destroying narration, these multiple interactions provide a "becoming" for narrative, a condition of possibility expressed in a "co-functioning" network.<sup>12</sup> This "ceaseless renarrativization" by way of parody and proliferation shows Joyce not only breaking from any attempt to write through direct narration but also turning from a critique of direct narration to the exploration of new terrains. Ultimately, "Cyclops" offers an experimental writing in the Deleuzian sense: one that remains opposed even to the pursuit of interpretation, one that is always "becoming" a narrative, but never settling for a definitive, stable form (Deleuze and Parnet 48–49).

The assemblage that is "Cyclops," with its multiple interactions and proliferating contexts, can be seen, then, as a "post"-ing to Ulysses's own modernist framework.<sup>13</sup> The function of the multiple by way of parody demonstrates not only this resistance but also the expressive form that results from these "betweens." "Cyclops" shows Joyce surrendering claims of narrative centrality, totality, and authority, while at the same time moving beyond a critique of narrative limitations and toward an expressive form that would not privilege any single style as central, healthy, or complete. In place of a centered, authoritative narrative, the "Cyclops" section presents a complex interaction between multiple, limited voices: a "rhizome" of narrative encounters. "Cyclops" presents an assemblage in place of a total/totalizing narrative, an open system of narrative resonances in which experimentation and proliferation replace the authority of the singular eye.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Gifford 258 counts 33 "interrupt[ions]," whereas Hayman 274–75 only notes 32 "asides." The missing parody is a single sentence of epic narrative: "And mournful and with a heavy heart he bewept the extinction of that beam of heaven" (*U* 12.405–06). For the purposes of this essay, I have stuck with Gifford's count as well as his taxonomy.

<sup>2</sup> The I-narrator's story also appears to be a tale that has already been told several times, one that has received the narrator's embellishments through repeated telling (Hayman 264–65).

<sup>3</sup> As Kenner notes, Bloom's interior monologue is conspicuously absent in this chapter. Kenner sees the I-narrator as "an expansive impersonation of a Dublin barfly" taken on by the "second narrator" of *Ulysses* (*Joyce's Voices* 77). More generally, however, impersonation functions throughout this section as a reminder that *any* narrative frame shapes the story it tells.

<sup>4</sup> Marilyn French, for example, sees two equally well-defined narrators telling the tale of "Cyclops" (141). Robert Bell, focusing on the tone of narration, also hears two "voices" at work in this section: that of the satirist and the parodist (9). Unlike these accounts, Lawrence's discussion of this chapter does emphasize the multiple forms of parody in this section, but she too returns to an opposition between "two stylistic 'masks': a naturalizing first-person narrative and the disruptive parodies (101).

<sup>5</sup> For further discussion of the relation between Joyce's writing and hypertext, see Landow 10, as well as Bolter's chapter "Interactive Fiction" (121–46, especially 135–37).

<sup>6</sup> Kenner, of course, has written quite extensively on Joyce's critique of narrative "objectivity." Toward the end of *Joyce's Voices* he writes, "truth is multiple, and the *whole* truth about even a circumscribed situation is probably incommunicable" (90). I would further suggest that while acknowledging this limitation, "Cyclops" at the same time presents a narrative strategy that evades the call of objectivity, while still offering a condition of narrative possibility.

<sup>7</sup> Gifford 308 provides this translation from the Latin. He also notes that the blessing is the *benedictio ad omnia*, a Catholic blessing used "on all occasions for which there is no specific blessing in a ritual."

<sup>8</sup> As already noted, the I-narrator's mocking voice is also responsible for the contextually inappropriate counterpoint to the epic execution-turned wedding:

With his mailed gauntlet he brushed away a furtive tear and was overheard, by those privileged burghers who happened to be in his immediate *entourage*, to murmur to himself in a faltering undertone: God blimey if she ain't a clinker, that there bleeding tart. (*U* 12.673–76).

<sup>9</sup> See Lawrence 104–05 for a summary.

<sup>10</sup> This assertion supplements (but does not cancel) claims that Joycean parody disrupts monoglossic, binary logic. See, for example, Kristeva's references to Joyce via Bahktin. See also Roughey 42–73.

<sup>11</sup> Although the chapter is indeed marked by clear opening and closing conventions, individual narratives do indeed open in varying directions. The result is a chapter that constantly produces "betweens" as narrative structures interact: narratives that deterritorialize and reterritorialize themselves over and over again in a multiple, heterogeneous assemblage. See Deleuze and Guattari 5–19.

<sup>12</sup> Valente 194 describes this assemblage as "a way of 'assembling between' already molecularized entities, making one multiplicity pass into another."

<sup>13</sup> Reizbaum pursues a similar line of argument, drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of "minor literature" to discuss Joyce's resistance to the closure of canonicity under the term *modernism*.

## WORKS CITED

- Bahktin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. and trans. Michael Holquist. Austin: U. Texas P, 1981.  
 Bell, Robert. *Jocoserious Joyce*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.

## ULYSSES'S "CYCLOPS"

- Bolter, Jay. *Writing Space*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum, 1991.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Claire Parnet. *Dialogues*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Columbia UP, 1987.
- French, Marilyn. *The Book as World*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1976.
- Gifford, Don. *Notes for Joyce*. New York: Dutton, 1974.
- Gilbert, Stuart. *James Joyce's Ulysses*. New York: Vintage, 1955.
- Groden, Michael. *Ulysses in Progress*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1977.
- Hayman, David. "Cyclops." *James Joyce's Ulysses: Critical Essays*. Ed. Clive Hart and David Hayman. Berkeley: U. of California P, 1974. 243-75.
- Herring, Philip F. *Joyce's Notes and Early Drafts for Ulysses*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1977.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism*. Durham: Duke UP, 1991.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. Ed. H. W. Gabler. New York: Vintage, 1986.
- Kelly, Dermot. *Narrative Strategies in Joyce's Ulysses*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1988.
- Kenner, Hugh. *Dublin's Joyce*. New York: Columbia UP, 1987.
- . *Joyce's Voices*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.
- Kiremidjian, David. *A Study of Modern Parody*. New York: Garland, 1985.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue, and Novel." *Desire in Language*. New York: Columbia UP, 1980. 64-91.
- Landow, George. *Hypertext*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1992.
- Lawrence, Karen. *The Odyssey of Style in Ulysses*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.
- Reizbaum, Marilyn. "The Minor Work of James Joyce." *James Joyce Quarterly* 30 (1993): 177-89.
- Roughy, Alan. "Joyce's Signs: Joyce and Semiotics." *James Joyce and Critical Theory*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1991. 42-73.
- Valente, Joseph. "Who Made the Tune: Becoming-Woman in 'Sirens'." *James Joyce Quarterly* 30 (1993): 191-237.